be given. 340 marked junglewood trees also were sold to one Keelath Govindan Nayar from these plantations at the seigniorage rates for timber and fuel at 12 annas a cart-load.

(d) Teak saplings were sold in public auction and in all 51 persons bid in auction and Rs. 13,858 realised. For the junglewood only one offer, Keelath Govindan Nayar. In 1103 only the value of 50 cart-loads of fuel and candies 10-17-23-15½ of Elavu and Cheeni, *viz.*, Rs. 37—8—0 and 10—12—0 or Rs. 48—4—0 was realised.

Complaints against the Kunnamkulam Police.

370. Mr. K. T. Mathew.— Will the Government be pleased to peruse the judgment in Calendar Case No. 318 of 1103 on the file of the 2nd Class Magistrate of Trichur in which the complainant is Sirkar, Kunnamkulam Police Station Cr. 39 of 1103 and state:—

(1) whether it is mentioned in it "Another petition containing almost the same allegations but duly stamped was presented by A3 in person on 13th Medam 1103 to the Talappalli Magistrate who forwarded it for remarks to the Kunnamkulam Sub-Inspector, P. W1, with instructions to see that A3 was not forcibly evicted from his residence, vide Ex. C." No action was taken upon that petition by the police for the next few days;

(2) what is the reason for not taking any action by the police for the next few days on a petition forwarded by the Magistrate for remarks;

(3) whether any explanation has been taken from the police for so neglecting the Magistrate's order, and if so, will it be placed on the Table; and if no explanation has been taken, what is the reason for not doing so;

(4) whether any explanation will now be called for in view of the judgment of the case;

(5) whether it is also stated in the course of the judgment "it would be seen from the above that the evidence adduced to bring home the charge to the accused is highly interested, conflicting, and against all probabilities. I do not, therefore, think it worthy of being acted upon. The prosecution evidence is, in my view, extremely shabby and utterly insufficient to warrant a conviction of the accused if unrebutted for any offence;" and in view of these remarks

(6) whether any explanation has been taken from the police at Kunnamkulam for promoting or instituting such a complaint; and if not, why not; whether any explanation will now be called for, and if not, why not;

(7) what is the total expenses of the Government including travelling allowance, etc., paid as a result of this case;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(8) whether the Government have considered the question of realising that amount from the police of Kunnamkulam for instituting or promoting a prosecution with (to cite the words of the Magistrate) 'extremely shabby and utterly insufficient' evidence and also supporting it with evidence characterised as highly interested, conflicting and against all probabilities;

(9) whether the Sub-Inspector referred to in the judgment is still retained at Kunnamkulam?

Mr. P. Nilakanta Menon.—(1) Yes.

(2) The matter was enquired into, the day after the receipt of the petition.

(3) and (4). No answer is necessary in view of that to (2).

(5) Yes.

(6) The complaint was neither instituted nor promoted by the Police.

(7) No separate accounts are kept.

(8) No.

(9) No.

371. Mr. K. T. Mathew.— Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) whether the Government have read the reports published in the (a) 'Malayalam Manorama' (Kottayam) of 3rd November 1928, (b) 'Samathvavathi' (Calicut) of 5th November 1928, (c) 'Sathianadam' (Ernakulam) of 27th October 1928, (d) 'Yogakshemam' (Trichur) of 27th October 1928, (e) 'Prathi-Dhinam' (Kottayam) and other newspapers also about the alleged corruption of some of the Police officers at Kunnamkulam and also about the alleged wrongful confinement of a woman by some of them;

(2) whether these newspaper cuttings will be placed on the Table;

(3) whether an enquiry has been conducted into these matters, and if so

(4) whether the reports of the enquiries will be placed on the Table;

(5) whether the enquiry was conducted before or after transferring the officers alleged to have been implicated in the matter from Kunnamkulam; and if it was conducted prior to their transfer;

(6) whether a thorough enquiry will be conducted after transferring them;

(7) whether all these officers are still retained at Kunnamkulam; and if not, who are still at Kunnamkulam;

(8) whether the names of all the officers alleged to have had a hand in the matter be printed and placed on the Table

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly